

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-16, and 34-38 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 13 have been amended while claims 4 and 17-33 have been canceled as shown on pages 2-4 of the Reply. In addition, new claims 34-38 have been added.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Kim for the teleconference of June 25, 2007. The merits of the claims in view of the cited art and 35 U.S.C. §101 were discussed. While it was agreed that the claims overcome rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) the Examiner stated that the claims could be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the components are stored in a memory.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claim 13

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following certain informalities. In view of the amendment to the subject claim, this objection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-7, 10, 11 and 13-16 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-7, 10, 11 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) as being anticipated by Vanderveldt *et al.* (U.S. 6,266,668). Vanderveldt *et al.* does not teach each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes *each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). (emphasis added).

The claimed subject matter relates to systems and methods that facilitate electronic data searching, and more particularly to systems and methods that employ a relevance function(s) to rank search results obtained from the domain of community archives for example, newsgroups.

In particular, independent claim 1 recites: *a first component that determines a relevance of respective search results associated with one or more of a Usenet, a discussion thread, a blog, an archived community discussion, or a chat room.* Vanderveldt *et al.* does not teach or suggest the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' claimed subject matter.

Vanderveldt *et al.* provides for system and method for dynamic data-mining and on-line communication of customized information in response to a query. A search specific profile is input to a data-mining search engine. The data-mining search engine mines the search specific profile and determines topics of interest. The search tools match the topics of interest to at least one destination data site wherein the destination data site are evaluated to determine if relevant information is present in the destination data site. Relevant information from the topics of interest is filtered and presented to the user making the query.

Hence, Vanderveldt *et al.* provides for only simple text matching, association with profile information and whether an article possessing high relevance links to the page in question. However, Vanderveldt *et al.* nowhere teaches or suggests ranking relevant results from web communities which are web virtual spaces where people can freely discuss and provide comments on essentially any topic and view other people's discussions and comments. Such data collections do not lend themselves to conventional search techniques such as those disclosed in Vanderveldt *et al.* as they are generally formatted in plain text and due to absence of features such as rich mark up (See applicants' specification as filed page 3 lines 4-12). The claimed subject matter provides for searching and ranking results selected from such virtual web spaces such as discussion groups *etc.* Accordingly, relevance functions for recognizing relevant search results are generated based on various features of such web spaces such as global thread properties, posting-specific thread properties, attributes of a person posting messages or newsgroups. Such relevance functions are tailored to efficiently and effectively rank search results from the community discussion domains.

Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully submits that an identical invention as recited in the subject claims is not taught or suggested by Vanderveldt *et al.* Therefore this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claims 1-7, 10, 11 and 13-16.

III. Rejection of Claims 8, 9, 12 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 8, 9, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderveldt *et al.* (US 6,266,668). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Vanderveldt *et al.* does not teach or suggest all the claim features with respect to amended independent claim 1 (which claims 8, 9 and 12 depend therefrom). Thus, the claimed subject matter as recited in claims 8, 9 and 12 is not obvious over Vanderveldt *et al.* and hence this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP594US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731